

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

February 28, 2001

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Vlad Voytilla called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

ROLL CALL:

Present were Chairman Vlad Voytilla, Planning Commissioners Bob Barnard, Gary Bliss, Eric Johansen, Brian Lynott and Dan Maks. Planning Commissioner Chuck Heckman was excused.

Planning Services Principal Planner Hal Bergsma, Senior Planner Barbara Fryer, Associate Planner Veronica Smith, Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Voytilla, who presented the format for the meeting.

VISITORS:

Chairman Voytilla asked if there were any visitors in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any non-agenda issue or item. There were none.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Chairman Voytilla observed that there has been a request for a continuance of the scheduled Public Hearing for CUP 2000-0031 -- Murray Hills Christian Church Addition

Principal Planner Hal Bergsma discussed the proposed work sessions prior to regular meetings, observing that staff has budgeted funding for these dinner meetings for next year. Noting that none of these special work sessions have been scheduled as yet, he mentioned that he anticipates that this would occur in the future with some of the more contentious issues.

Chairman Voytilla requested that the Planning Commission receive adequate advance notification of these meetings.

Mr. Bergsma assured Chairman Voytilla that staff would provide as much consideration and notification as possible.

1 Observing that these work sessions could occur on a semi-regular basis,
2 Commissioner Maks suggested that staff obtain information regarding any
3 specific food allergies that members of the Planning Commission might have.
4

5 **OLD BUSINESS:**

6
7 Chairman Voytilla opened the Public Hearing and read the format for Public
8 Hearings. There were no disqualifications of the Planning Commission members.
9 No one in the audience challenged the right of any Commissioner to hear any of
10 the agenda items, to participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be
11 postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of
12 interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda. There was no
13 response.
14

15 **CONTINUANCES:**

16
17 **A. CPA 99-00013/TA 99-00005 -- GOAL 5 WILDLIFE HABITAT & TREE**
18 **PRESERVATION AMENDMENTS**

19 (Continued from August 9, 2000)

20 The proposed amendments implement Periodic Review Order #00717 (formerly
21 WO #00628), Work Task #3 -- Statewide Planning Goal 5 Wildlife Habitat. This
22 Work Task amends City Comprehensive Plan policies and Development Code
23 regulations implementing Oregon Administrative Rule Section 660-23-110 for
24 protection of Significant Tree, Tree Groves and Historical Trees, as identified on
25 the Significant Natural Resource Map. Further, these amendments: (1) establish
26 guidelines for protection of trees identified on the referenced map; and (2) provide
27 protection for trees identified on the Washington County Community Plan and
28 Map as a protected resource following annexation to the City.
29

30 **B. CPA 99-00017/CPA 99-00018 -- LOCAL TREE INVENTORY UPDATE**

31 (Continued from August 9, 2000)

32 The proposed amendments implement Periodic Review Order #00717 (formerly
33 WO #00628), Work Task #3 -- Goal 5 Inventory. This work task is intended to
34 bring the City of Beaverton Comprehensive Plan Map up to date with respect to
35 Natural Resources. The amendment (CPA 99-00017) would update the current
36 Tree Inventory Map to include significant groves and trees that have been altered
37 since the last inventory. The proposal includes adding five new significant trees
38 to the inventory, which are located on the following map and tax lots:
39 1N120BA03900, 1S133BD90000 and 1S128DA06100, and in the right-of-way
40 adjacent to SW Davies Road between SW Harness and SW Stallion Court.
41 Recommendations regarding the significance of the proposed trees will be
42 discussed in detail in the staff report.
43

44 The text update (CPA 99-00018) includes one new page per significant grove or
45 tree, which details the grove/tree health, a general comment about the grove/tree
46 and a photo. Staff proposes adopting the map (CPA 99-00017) as an update,

1 adding appropriate new significant trees (CPA 99-00017 and CPA 99-00018) and
2 updated pages (CPA 99-00018). Please note the new computer-generated map
3 would replace the current map in its entirety, however, the new photos and health
4 reports will supplement existing data.

5
6 Mr. Bergsma announced that he had submitted a Memorandum indicating that
7 these applications have been withdrawn by staff on behalf of Mayor Drake for a
8 variety of reasons, adding that this results in cancellation of these Public
9 Hearings. Observing that there would be a work session regarding these issues
10 following the regular meeting, he advised that because the nature of these
11 applications has changed over time, new applications for the same basic issues
12 would be resubmitted at a later time.

13
14 Chairman Voytilla clarified certain corrections to the conclusion of the
15 Memorandum, as follows:

- 16
17 1. CPA 2000-~~0011~~ **99-0012**; and
18 2. ~~TA-2000-0008~~ **99-0004**.

19
20 Mr. Bergsma pointed out that the first correction should actually be CPA 99-
21 **00013**, adding that these applications have been withdrawn and the Public
22 Hearings cancelled.

23
24 Commissioner Barnard requested that Planning Commissioners receive complete
25 new packets when these applications are resubmitted.

26
27 Mr. Bergsma advised Mr. Barnard that this would involve new applications,
28 rather than continuances, adding that that entirely new information and packets
29 would be submitted.

30
31 **NEW BUSINESS:**

32
33 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

34
35 **A. CUP 2000-0031 -- MURRAY HILLS CHRISTIAN CHURCH ADDITION**
36 **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT**

37 (Request for continuance to April 18, 2001)

38 This land use order requesting an expansion of the church of the existing
39 conditional use for the intention of increasing the size of the fellowship hall and
40 the number of classrooms. No expansion is proposed to the main sanctuary area.
41 The proposed addition includes a three-story portion located on the south building
42 elevation. The highest portion of the proposed building addition is 42 feet and the
43 lowest portion of the existing building is 23 feet. Accordingly, the average
44 overall building height of the church would be approximately 32.5 feet, with the
45 decision based on the approval criteria listed in Section 40.05.15.2.C of the
46 Beaverton Development Code. The proposed expansion is for the Murray Hills

1 Christian Church at 15050 SW Weir Road, generally located west of SW 148th
2 Avenue and south of SW Weir Road. The site is specifically identified on
3 Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-32AA, Tax Lot 400. The subject
4 property is zoned Urban Standard Density (R-5) and is approximately 3.89 acres
5 in size. Within the R-5 zone, churches and related facilities are permitted as a
6 conditional use.

7
8 Commissioner Maks **MOVED** and Commissioner Barnard **SECONDED** a
9 motion that CUP 2000-0031 -- Murray Hills Christian Church Addition
10 Conditional Use Permit be continued to a date certain of April 18, 2001.

11
12 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

13
14 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

15
16 Minutes of the meeting of January 31, 2001, submitted. Commissioner Maks
17 **MOVED** and Commissioner Bliss **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be
18 approved as written.

19
20 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

21
22 Minutes of the meeting of February 7, 2001, submitted. Commissioner Bliss
23 **MOVED** and Commissioner Maks **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be
24 approved as written.

25
26 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

27
28 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

29
30 Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura discussed the status of the Haggens' Store
31 litigation. He noted that the appeal from the City Council to the Land Use Board
32 of Appeals (LUBA) regarding several of the Haggens' approvals has been stayed
33 for a short period of time at the request of both the appellants and the applicants.

34
35 Commissioner Maks questioned the status of Measure 7.

36
37 Mr. Naemura advised Commissioner Maks that some sort of appeal is expected
38 on Measure 7.

39
40 At the request of Chairman Voytilla, who observed that there were guests in the
41 audience, he was advised five students from Portland State University are in
42 attendance to observe and take notes.

43
44 7:20 p.m. to 7:25 p.m. -- break.

45
46 **WORK SESSION:**

GOAL 5 WILDLIFE HABITAT & TREE PRESERVATION
MENDMENTS and LOCAL TREE INVENTORY UPDATE

Observing that Senior Planner Barbara Fryer is currently involved with a meeting of the Committee for Citizens Involvement (CCI), Mr. Bergsma discussed the process for protecting trees, adding that staff would like input from the Planning Commissioners. Noting that preliminary work had been done in the 1980's and 1990's, he commented that the situation has changed, over time, as additional development has occurred, adding that staff had felt that it would be appropriate to reevaluate the situation, applying standard evaluation criteria through a standard process. He discussed the analysis of the environmental, social, economic and energy (ESEE) consequences of protection of significant resources versus allowing their development, which is another step in the Goal 5 process, noting that a conclusion would be made regarding the protection of the trees determined to be worthy of protection. He mentioned that staff would like to discuss the criteria for significance at this time, specifically quality, quantity or locational aspects that determine this significance. He referred to the three categories of trees, including groves of trees, individual trees, and rows or corridors of trees, adding that significance criteria have been developed for each of these categories. He discussed the first page, regarding individual trees,

Associate Planner Veronica Smith provided copies of criteria sheets and illustrations and discussed what she described as not very successful efforts of Ms. Fryer and herself to inventory trees based upon information from the previous criteria prepared by the consultants. She explained that they had created new categories, including a different point system, expressing her opinion that this new system would more adequately rate these trees in terms of their aesthetic values. She discussed the mapping system, adding that there is an extensive amount of information provided in the inventory, including aerial photographs, and provided several illustrations depicting the quality and quantity of these trees.

Mr. Bergsma emphasized that staff is open to suggestions regarding certain trees and groves of trees for consideration, pointing out that while locations of groves of trees have most likely been determined, individual trees may be more difficult to identify.

Mr. Barnard expressed his opinion that this is an immense project, and questioned whether staff intends to actually identify and number each individual tree independently or only in significant groves.

Mr. Bergsma advised Mr. Barnard that every individual tree within the City of Beaverton would not be identified, adding that staff would focus on some individual trees and groves, although very few large groves remain.

1 Referring to the *Oregon Administrative Rule* (OAR), Ms. Smith described the
2 approach to Development Code regulations, including ways to allow development
3 to occur to its maximum density.
4

5 Chairman Voytilla requested that staff provide copies of these documents to
6 Planning Commissioners.
7

8 Mr. Bergsma clarified that the basic objective of Goal 5 is to protect these
9 resources that are identified as significant, adding that there are various categories
10 of natural resources listed, although the City of Beaverton is focusing on scenic
11 resources. He pointed out that while local governments are not required to
12 address scenic resources, the City of Beaverton is taking this action voluntarily.
13

14 Chairman Voytilla discussed several significant trees that are located within the
15 eventual right-of-way of anticipated development.
16

17 Mr. Bergsma advised Chairman Voytilla that staff would have to consider the
18 pros and cons of preserving certain trees versus allowing development.
19

20 Ms. Smith referred to the final photograph, referring to a corridor with Oak Trees
21 that have been significantly altered, specifically whether this should be considered
22 a corridor tree if it has been compromised in that way.
23

24 Commissioner Maks questioned whether Chairman Voytilla intends to review
25 each page and discuss the criteria.
26

27 Chairman Voytilla advised Commissioner Maks that he would prefer to review
28 each individual page, expressing his opinion that this would provide for more
29 organized input to staff.
30

31 Commissioner Maks observed that either the City of Beaverton or *The Valley*
32 *Times* identifies the most beautiful tree in the City of Beaverton on an annual
33 basis, suggesting that staff obtain this information from the editor of the
34 newspaper for the inventory.
35

36 Mr. Naemura questioned whether staff anticipates that the current planning
37 process would foreclose other portions or elements of the plans, specifically other
38 comprehensive policies for analysis and preservation.
39

40 Mr. Bergsma requested clarification of whether Mr. Naemura is asking whether
41 current actions would determine that trees could only be protected for scenic
42 purposes.
43

44 Mr. Naemura clarified that he is questioning whether if planning is approached
45 through this administrative rule, these would be the only policies recognized
46 regarding the preservation of trees in the City of Beaverton.

1 Mr. Bergsma observed that criteria would be discussed, although other
2 "secondary" informational aspects regarding the trees would be obtained as well.

3
4 Ms. Smith emphasized that trees are also protected through other policies,
5 including the wetland regulations, adding that the riparian corridors are also
6 provided with a certain level of protection. She pointed out that the development
7 process also requires a certain amount of landscape trees.

8
9 Mr. Naemura emphasized that there appears to be no conflicts between these
10 policies, which he described as mutually supportive and related.

11
12 Ms. Smith pointed out that there would be a stronger argument for the protection
13 of a tree or trees located within a significant tree grove or tree corridor that is also
14 located within a riparian area.

15
16 7:43 p.m. – Ms. Fryer arrived.

17
18 Mr. Naemura noted that significance had been determined by the presence or
19 absence of certain life of fish, adding that good-looking streams were not
20 necessarily significant for that specific Goal 5 purpose.

21
22 Mr. Bergsma reminded Mr. Naemura that trees in the wetlands are generally
23 already protected, adding that this process is mostly concerned with the trees in
24 the upland areas.

25
26 Chairman Voytilla referred to the overall methodology for this process,
27 specifically whether staff would attempt to prioritize and identify groves initially
28 and then go on to individual trees.

29
30 Referring to the Shapiro maps, Ms. Fryer advised Chairman Voytilla that staff had
31 anticipated working with aerial photos and identifying tree resources that had not
32 been captured in the original mapping process. She mentioned that the NACs had
33 been requested to review the maps, adding that she had scheduled a deadline of
34 April 27, 2001 to return information to staff. She described the process in which
35 staff would mark up the map overlay sheets on top of groves, adding that they
36 would then use the camera to identify groves, individual trees and corridors. She
37 pointed out that the emphasis would be identification on a section by section
38 basis, rather than each particular resource individually, adding that at this point
39 any additional information submitted by the NACs would be included. Observing
40 that staff anticipates changes in the process, she noted that current resources
41 should not be subject to outdated regulations that might not be applicable.

42
43 Chairman Voytilla requested clarification of an approximate time when the final
44 document could be available.

45

1 Ms. Fryer advised Chairman Voytilla that staff anticipates that an inventory
2 should be available by mid-May 2001, adding that including the NAC information
3 should not involve a great deal of time, once it is received.
4

5 Commissioner Barnard questioned whether this would also include the
6 restructuring of the 5% rule.
7

8 Ms. Fryer informed Commissioner Barnard that this would involve the inventory
9 and recommendations, adding that the 5% rule would not be included. She
10 mentioned that the consultants would be requested to prepare the ESEE analysis,
11 based upon the concurrence of the Planning Commissioners of the inventory and
12 staff determination of which resources are significant.
13

14 Mr. Bergsma explained that the preservation of a tree does not necessarily involve
15 a regulation, adding that often other methods are available.
16

17 Mr. Naemura questioned whether staff anticipates receiving new information
18 about previously inventoried trees, as they exist today, suggesting that trees that
19 had been planted in the past could have grown to reach what is considered worthy
20 of a significant status.
21

22 Ms. Fryer advised Mr. Naemura that staff expects to know a lot more about the
23 trees in the City, emphasizing that some trees that are planted by developers
24 would not be considered significant and would not be included in this inventory.
25 She pointed out that these same trees could possibly be considered significant
26 twenty years in the future, when they reach a size of at least six inches in trunk
27 diameter. She discussed another project, specifically the Tree Preservation Plan
28 Project, in which staff is attempting to map all of the tree preservation plans and
29 identify the groves and portions of groves that are preserved, and identify more
30 specifically what was supposed to be preserved and consider mapping the
31 resource as an assist to the front counter and the public. She discussed an issue
32 regarding the Board of Design Review actions between 1988 and 1991, when
33 Tree Preservation Plans were not actually completed as separate applications.
34

35 Ms. Smith mentioned that although some of the trees in areas, such as in Griffith
36 Park, may not be large enough today to be considered significant, this doesn't
37 necessarily mean that they shouldn't be mentioned at this time for potential future
38 consideration.
39

40 Commissioner Maks discussed the methodology, expressing his agreement with
41 the point on the groves, suggesting the possibility of development impacts.
42

43 Chairman Voytilla pointed out that it has been fortunate that applicants with
44 significant trees on their property have voluntarily taken action to preserve these
45 trees.
46

1 Commissioner Maks mentioned criteria, specifically individual trees, and
2 discussed appearance, requesting a definition of color and whether this means
3 only leaves or includes berries or other features.
4

5 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Maks that color would include leaves, berries
6 and blossoms.
7

8 Chairman Voytilla commented that he would like to discuss individual trees first,
9 followed by corridors and then groves.
10

11 Commissioner Maks discussed the problems involved with incorrect pruning,
12 questioning whether pruning should be considered that important. Observing that
13 pruning is an important element of the health of the tree, he noted that
14 consideration should be given to whether the tree could be pruned properly. He
15 emphasized that it is extremely difficult to properly prune a very tall tree.
16

17 Ms. Fryer referred to the trees in Lombard Corridor, observing that the centers of
18 several tall Oak Trees currently included in the Significant Tree Inventory have
19 actually been cut out for the power lines, emphasizing that these trees would not
20 survive on a long-term basis. Agreeing that these are beautiful trees, she
21 questioned whether these should actually be considered significant in this
22 condition, adding that they could die within ten years.
23

24 Commissioner Maks reminded Ms. Fryer that the Planning Commission is now
25 considering aesthetic value and that these are currently beautiful trees in spite of
26 the fact that they have been pruned to accommodate power lines and will
27 eventually die. He discussed the branch character and foliage, expressing his
28 opinion that this provides a good example.
29

30 Mr. Bergsma suggested that maybe the health or sustainability of an individual
31 tree or grove should not be included in the significance criteria.
32

33 Commissioner Maks advised Mr. Bergsma that he is probably considering the
34 Category 2 trees more, such as those in the Dapplegrey Loop area, which are all
35 over fifty feet tall, adding that the development had been there for thirteen to
36 fifteen years. He pointed out that he is certain that none of these particular trees
37 has ever been pruned.
38

39 Ms. Fryer commented that the middle category does not necessarily indicate that a
40 tree has never been pruned, adding that they might have been pruned incorrectly.
41

42 Commissioner Maks pointed out that there is a difference between trees that have
43 been pruned by property owners and those on a Tualatin Hills Parks and
44 Recreation District (THPRD) tract that have been properly pruned. He expressed
45 his opinion that while they are aesthetically similar, the criteria designates that

1 those owned by private property owners have less value. He questioned the
2 difference between the terms "not rare" and "common to Beaverton".
3

4 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Maks that "common to Beaverton" should be
5 revised to "uncommon to Beaverton" in all applicable sections.
6

7 Commissioner Barnard questioned whether tree criteria would be used as a
8 grounds for utility under grounding or removal or if trees would continued to be
9 pruned to allow the lines to travel through them.
10

11 Commissioner Maks pointed out that not all of these lines could be located
12 underground.
13

14 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Maks that this would be considered through the
15 ESEE process, adding that in some locations, the economics of relocating a utility
16 line underground is not feasible and the tree would not be preserved. She pointed
17 out that this would also be a consideration in road construction projects, adding
18 that it would be necessary to inventory and determine significance prior to
19 reviewing other issues and conducting the ESEE analysis. She discussed the
20 necessity of making any determination to protect an area, allow full development,
21 or something in between.
22

23 Chairman Voytilla referred to the reference of fifty feet, expressing his opinion
24 that while this should carry some weight in determining significance, this could
25 vary greatly with different species. He explained that some trees that would not
26 naturally grow to a height of fifty feet could still be considered significant for
27 various other reasons.
28

29 Mr. Bergsma suggested that the fifty-foot requirement be revised to reflect that
30 the trees should attain 75% of their growth potential.
31

32 Ms. Fryer observed that the 75% growth potential is feasible, noting that it is
33 possible to use the *Sunset Garden Book* and other resources to determine
34 standards.
35

36 Chairman Voytilla suggested that some distinction should be made regarding
37 indigenous trees versus imported trees, emphasizing that the native trees should
38 be considered more significant. Referring to staff photographs of the Lombard
39 Corridor trees, he noted that he had been accused of losing a 1,000-year-old Oak
40 Tree in a project and emphasized that 1,000-year-old Oak Trees do not exist. He
41 pointed out that an arborist had informed him that any Oak Tree over 100 years
42 old is beginning to go into a decline, emphasizing that trees do actually have a
43 natural life span, which depends upon the species.
44

1 Ms. Fryer advised Chairman Voytilla that staff does not really have sufficient
2 expertise to determine the exact age of a tree, adding that although they are
3 providing assistance, the consultants are not responsible for the actual inventory.
4 Chairman Voytilla suggested that staff could request that the consultants review
5 and make a determination on any individual tree.

6
7 Ms. Fryer agreed, adding that they also have an available resource in the City
8 arborists.

9
10 On question, Chairman Voytilla advised Ms. Smith that while he had been
11 referring to individual trees, he believes that this would be applicable to groves
12 also. He questioned whether staff would be working with utility providers,
13 specifically for the purpose of curtailing some of the pruning to maintain the
14 utility corridors. He mentioned that this would be an issue, noting that these
15 utilities do have easements.

16
17 Ms. Fryer expressed her opinion that with the ESEE analysis, it would be
18 determined that the use as a utility would take precedence over the use as a tree.

19
20 Mr. Bergsma requested that staff note the presence of any utility lines while
21 conducting their inventory.

22
23 Commissioner Maks mentioned connectivity, pointing out that he wants to make
24 certain that the squirrels are able to travel from location to location. He referred
25 to page 3 regarding corridors, specifically accessibility, and questioned the
26 rationale for rating high accessibility/unrestricted public access. He commented
27 that Category 2 fits into the majority of the riparian areas, the majority of the
28 stream corridors, the majority of the protected areas and large developments, and
29 natural areas, which are generally more aesthetically pleasing than unrestricted
30 public accesses, with the exception of the THPRD Nature Park.

31
32 Ms. Fryer reminded Commissioner Maks that these trees are generally protected
33 under the stream regulations and do not necessarily need to be included in this
34 tree program, particularly if they fall within the fifty foot buffer required by
35 Unified Sewerage Agency (USA).

36
37 Observing that the corridor used to be twenty-five feet, Mr. Bergsma pointed out
38 that this has increased to fifty feet and would be providing a greater amount of
39 protection.

40
41 Ms. Fryer commented that if the trees have somehow been protected through the
42 Development Review process, the Tree Preservation Plan map would include all
43 of the conditioned trees and would serve to protect those areas.

44 Commissioner Maks emphasized that the creation of a Tree Preservation Plan
45 does not prevent a developer from proposing a new Tree Preservation Plan
46 through redevelopment.

1 Ms. Fryer pointed out that this has been set aside as a separate tract and these
2 trees are required to be documented, adding that a developer could not come back
3 and develop this preserved plat.
4

5 Commissioner Maks stated that a developer could revise a Tree Preservation Plan
6 if the trees were not specifically identified as being located within a significant
7 grove but through the development application process they were conditioned to
8 remain and allowed the developer to shift density.
9

10 Mr. Bergsma discussed the category he referred to as rows, which he described as
11 a manicured grouping of trees that have been planted in the past as a means of
12 identifying a travel route.
13

14 Mr. Naemura questioned whether there is an implied connection to the human
15 environment.
16

17 Mr. Bergsma pointed out that the trees have to be visible from public property,
18 noting that if the tree is not visible and the public receives no value, it does not
19 count.
20

21 Chairman Voytilla pointed out that redevelopment might create a means for the
22 public to view a tree that had not been visible previously.
23

24 Mr. Bergsma mentioned that the tree would become significant at that point,
25 emphasizing that visibility and accessibility are separate issues.
26

27 Commissioner Maks requested clarification of how accessibility is a criteria.
28

29 Mr. Bergsma advised Commissioner Maks that accessibility does not necessarily
30 need to be considered a criterion.
31

32 Commissioner Maks expressed his opinion that accessibility should not be a
33 criterion.
34

35 Mr. Bergsma suggested that a tree that was accessible to the public could be of
36 greater importance than a tree that could only be viewed from a distance.
37

38 Commissioner Maks assured Mr. Bergsma that while he agrees that accessibility
39 is important, he is not certain that this should be an actual requirement.
40

41 Ms. Fryer reminded Commissioner Maks that the current discussion only involves
42 corridors, pointing out that this involves significant corridors or rows of trees.
43

44 Commissioner Maks clarified that his problem involves why staff would want to
45 grade these trees differently with regard to medium accessibility, semi-public
46 common open space or managed by a non-profit organization.

1 Ms. Fryer suggested deletion of medium accessibility and revising the words after
2 medium accessibility to high accessibility, emphasizing that they are accessible to
3 a population.

4
5 Chairman Voytilla referred to the corridor designation mentioned by Mr.
6 Bergsma, emphasizing that the tree needs to be adjacent to a public right-of-way
7 or public pathway.

8
9 Mr. Bergsma advised Chairman Voytilla that the tree could also be adjacent to a
10 private pathway.

11
12 Chairman Voytilla clarified that there must be access for the general public.

13
14 Commissioner Maks pointed out that while he understands Category 1, he would
15 like some clarification between Category 2 and Category 3.

16
17 Mr. Naemura mentioned that the high accessibility designation is not actually
18 applicable in this situation, adding that it might be appropriate to equally weight
19 both Category 2 and Category 3.

20
21 Ms. Fryer suggested that the comments from that section could be moved to high
22 accessibility and nothing in medium accessibility.

23
24 Commissioner Barnard expressed his opinion that high accessibility of a grove of
25 trees would have greater merit than medium or low accessibility. He pointed out
26 that every corridor is rated the same and rating of individual trees is not relevant.

27
28 Commissioner Johansen commented that he is not certain that accessibility should
29 carry any weight in the rating of a tree or grove, pointing out that recreational
30 value might be a more important factor in determining the importance of
31 accessibility. He discussed the uniformity of species, expressing his opinion that
32 such trees in a confined area should be considered a corridor and that diversity of
33 a species enhances this corridor value visually and aesthetically.

34
35 Commissioner Maks suggested that Chairman Voytilla should obtain a consensus
36 on the issue of accessibility. He pointed out that he is not aware of staff's time
37 line on this issue or when they would bring back the criteria.

38
39 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Maks that staff would return with the ratings,
40 adding that they would like to establish the categories at this time, if possible, for
41 the purpose of collecting the data appropriately.

42
43 On question, Chairman Voytilla requested that staff e-mail all of the revisions to
44 members of the Planning Commission to review and comment.

45
46 Ms. Fryer questioned whether all Planning Commissioners have access to Word.

1 Commissioner Maks cautioned Ms. Fryer that Commissioner Heckman does not
2 have Word.

3
4 Ms. Fryer assured Commissioner Maks that she would hand-deliver the revisions
5 and information to Commissioner Heckman.

6
7 Chairman Voytilla pointed out that he would like to reach a consensus on the
8 issue of accessibility.

9
10 Mr. Naemura observed that generally with these statistic-oriented exercises, the
11 most difficult work concerns the criteria and the weighting, adding that the
12 observations and analysis tend to flow.

13
14 Commissioner Barnard expressed his support of the separations, pointing out that
15 a consensus provides more detailed requirements and simplifies identification of
16 priorities.

17
18 Commissioner Maks expressed his agreement with Commissioner Barnard's
19 comments, adding that accessibility should not be a requirement when
20 considering visual and aesthetics.

21
22 Chairman Voytilla stated that he would like a consensus on the accessibility issue.

23
24 Commissioner Maks suggested that accessibility be eliminated on individual trees
25 and corridors, pointing out that groves have not yet been discussed.

26
27 Commissioner Bliss concurred with Commissioner Maks' suggestion that
28 accessibility be eliminated on individual trees and corridors.

29
30 Commissioner Barnard expressed his disagreement with eliminating accessibility
31 on individual trees and corridors.

32
33 Commissioner Johansen expressed his agreement that accessibility should be
34 eliminated on individual trees and corridors.

35
36 Commissioner Lynott expressed his agreement that accessibility should be
37 eliminated on individual trees and corridors.

38
39 Chairman Voytilla observed that while he views accessibility as having some
40 value, it is not actually necessary.

41
42 Ms. Fryer requested clarification of whether accessibility should not be
43 considered for both individual trees and corridors of trees.

44

1 Chairman Voytilla advised Ms. Fryer that accessibility should be eliminated for
2 both individual trees and corridors, adding that groves would be considered
3 separately.

4
5 Commissioner Maks referred to a study that indicated that a circular grove has a
6 better chance of survival than a square or rectangular grove.

7
8 Ms. Fryer clarified that the study had attempted to determine what is necessary for
9 a wildlife habitat to function when part of it is removed, emphasizing that the core
10 of that particular grove is a necessary element to maintain stability for wildlife
11 functions. She pointed out that if the edge of the grove has been disturbed
12 significantly through development it is extremely likely that the grove has already
13 been reduced to whatever core is necessary to allow it to function. She
14 emphasized that the removal of additional trees would most likely jeopardize the
15 health of the tree grove.

16
17 Commissioner Maks expressed his opinion that accessibility is an important factor
18 and should not be eliminated in tree groves.

19
20 Commissioner Barnard questioned whether the appearance issue regarding single
21 trees is also valid with rows of trees and tree groves, specifically as it relates to
22 height and the attainment of a percentage of a tree's growth potential.

23
24 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Barnard that she had made a note of this and
25 intends to carry this through, as well as the decision rating a native tree higher
26 than one not native to this area.

27
28 Chairman Voytilla commented that utility lines must be installed and questioned
29 whether this action threatens the general health of a tree grove.

30
31 Ms. Fryer advised Chairman Voytilla that cutting through the trees to
32 accommodate utility lines could create problems for a tree grove.

33
34 Commissioner Johansen requested clarification of the concept regarding the grove
35 edge, pointing out that in his opinion, any existing groves have been disturbed at
36 some point.

37
38 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Johansen that while this is correct, the
39 consulting arborist had indicated that if a disturbance is less than ten years old, the
40 affected grove of trees is still attempting to adjust. She pointed out that
41 identification of disturbances that occurred more than ten years ago would have
42 less of an edge effect on a particular grove of trees than a more recent disturbance.

43
44 Commissioner Johansen observed that the longer a grove of trees has existed in its
45 current state the more likely the trees would not be as negatively impacted.

46

1 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Johansen that if development is causing the
2 removal of the fourth side of a grove of trees it might not matter how long it had
3 been since a previous disturbance.
4

5 Ms. Smith pointed out that the project also contains an educational component
6 that involves providing adequate information regarding tree preservation to the
7 owners of property adjacent to any grove of trees.
8

9 Commissioner Lynott expressed his disagreement with Commissioner Maks,
10 expressing his opinion that accessibility is not a relevant issue for tree groves.
11

12 Commissioner Johansen expressed his opinion that accessibility is a different
13 issue for tree groves than for tree corridors, adding that the public could benefit
14 from and enjoy accessibility of tree groves.
15

16 Ms. Fryer observed that accessibility would be desirable in any property that
17 involves public ownership.
18

19 Chairman Voytilla emphasized that existing accessibility is a desirable feature for
20 tree groves and worthy of including in the criteria.
21

22 Commissioner Barnard emphasized that as a public entity it is necessary to make
23 a reasonable attempt to consider public accessibility.
24

25 Commissioner Bliss expressed his opinion that all tree groves should be
26 considered equally, with the exception of the accessibility issue.
27

28 Chairman Voytilla pointed out that not having a value system assigned to some of
29 these trees is creating a problem, emphasizing that it is necessary to identify the
30 potential existence of a resource.
31

32 Mr. Bergsma mentioned that there appears to be conflicting opinions regarding
33 the importance of accessibility as it relates to tree groves, adding that a decision
34 on whether accessibility should be included in the criteria could be deferred to a
35 later time.
36

37 Commissioner Maks emphasized that he is in favor of including accessibility in
38 the criteria for tree groves.
39

40 Chairman Voytilla observed that the majority of the Planning Commissioners
41 have indicated that they would like accessibility included in the criteria for tree
42 groves.
43

44 Ms. Fryer suggested scheduling another work session in March 2001, adding that
45 actual point values should be available for review at that time.

1 Commissioner Johansen questioned whether there would be a comparison of
2 groves to groves and corridors to corridors.

3
4 Ms. Fryer clarified that the three distinct categories, including individual trees,
5 tree corridors and tree groves, would each be considered separately, adding that
6 once point values have been determined, those with 50% or more would be
7 considered significant.

8
9 Commissioner Barnard suggested that samples be provided with assigned values.

10
11 Commissioner Maks complimented the efforts of staff on this issue, expressing
12 his opinion that they have accomplished a great deal.

13
14 Commissioner Bliss referred to page 7, pointing out that while he is aware that
15 this is not relevant in determining significance, the *Oregon Business and*
16 *Industrial Association* (OBIA) had conducted a study that indicated a conflicting
17 opinion from that imposed by Metro and other agencies. He commented that they
18 had determined that trees shading streams are actually detrimental to the food
19 chain, which is necessary for the conveyance of salmon, trout and steelhead.

20
21 Mr. Bergsma advised Commissioner Bliss that staff has received copies of the
22 referenced OBIA executive summaries, adding that they have also attended some
23 presentations regarding this issue. He pointed out that this basically relates only
24 to salmon and trout.

25
26 Referring to the edge effects on a particular grove, Ms. Fryer commented that a
27 tree grove may, in some instances, be more sustainable if closer to a stream
28 corridor or protected area than if it is not.

29
30 Mr. Bergsma observed that much of this issue is beyond the expertise and
31 comprehension of staff, adding that some policy decisions would become
32 necessary.

33
34 Ms. Fryer referred to Sheet 7, noting that this would apply only to tree groves.

35
36 Chairman Voytilla suggested the possibility of rating based upon best
37 management practices for current and future survival of the trees.

38
39 Ms. Fryer pointed out that this is why some of the criteria involves edge effects
40 and related issues.

41
42 Chairman Voytilla pointed out that a private property owner might not have
43 adequate means with which to maintain significant trees or groves.

44
45 Ms. Fryer observed that this is why a significant tree located on private property
46 might have a lower rating.

1 Chairman Voytilla mentioned that some direction could be provided to a private
2 property owner to protect the tree and the interest of the public.

3

4 Ms. Fryer advised Chairman Voytilla that this is part of the public information
5 campaign that would be included in the final product for this project, emphasizing
6 that staff intends to notify individuals of the existence of significant trees on their
7 property and what kind of care is appropriate.

8

9 Chairman Voytilla expressed concern with the preservation and health of trees
10 located on private property that do not receive proper pruning.

11

12 Ms. Fryer clarified that these issues would be addressed through the ESEE
13 analysis, adding that economic and environmental issues regarding each
14 individual tree would be considered. She pointed out that there is a possibility of
15 an option providing assistance to low-income property owners with significant
16 trees.

17

18 On question, Chairman Voytilla advised Ms. Fryer that he had received the e-mail
19 indicating that Alternate Planning Commissioner Russell Davis would not be in
20 attendance this evening due to work-related damages caused by the earthquake
21 that required him to travel to the Seattle area.

22

23 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

24

25 Chairman Voytilla referred to the upcoming schedule of agendas, noting that
26 some are actually continuances involving the 120-day requirement and
27 emphasizing the importance of having all Planning Commissioners attend.

28

29 Commissioner Johansen advised Chairman Voytilla that he would be absent April
30 25, 2001.

31

32 Commissioner Maks advised Chairman Voytilla that he would be absent March
33 14, 2001.

34

35 The meeting adjourned at 9:19 p.m.